DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 643 HE 011 380

AUTHOR Winschel, Carolyn

TITLE Administrative Evaluation. Administrator's Update. Volume 1, Number 1.
INSTITUTION American Association of University Administrators, Buffalo, N.Y.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 7p.; Parts may not reproduce clearly due to colored background
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of University Administrators, Administrators Update, P.O. Box 6, Bidwell Station, Buffalo, NY 14222 ($.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Evaluation; *College Administration; *Competence; *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Leadership Qualities; Presidents
IDENTIFIERS Information Analysis Products; Objectivity

ABSTRACT

Literature relevant to administrative evaluation in higher education was surveyed. Reasons for the increasing importance of this type of evaluation, approaches to and components of an evaluation plan, some of the problems involved in the evaluation process, and use of results are discussed. The current literature indicates that increased presure from above and below and the demand for accountability from government and institutional constituencies make administrative evaluation important. Evaluation usually presupposes some sort of comparison either with predecessors, peers, some ideal, past performance, or others' expectations. Evaluation criteria usually concern administrative skills and personal characteristics. The idea of faculty involvement in administrative evaluation seems to be growing in acceptance but ultimate responsibility rests with the board. The greatest problem in evaluation is the difficulty of rational and objective judgment. Generally, higher education does not really lend itself very readily to systematic assessment. The use of results should be known and agreed to by all concerned prior to the actual evaluation process. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172643

ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE

Volume 1, Number 1

American Association of University Administrators

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

Administrative Evaluation

Evaluation in higher education is anything but an innovation. Evaluation of students has been a topic of research and experimentation almost since the inception of higher education. Rating scales for teaching performance have been in existence for almost fifty years and the past fifteen to twenty years have seen increasing attention given to development of programs for faculty development. Administrative evaluation is the latest "newcomer" to the scene of evaluation in higher education and is still in its infancy as indicated by the literature on this topic (Fenker 1975; Genova et al. 1976; Surwill and Heywood 1976; Van de Visse 1974). The purpose of this study is to provide a survey of the literature relevant to administrative evaluation in higher education. Consideration will be given to reasons for the increasing importance of this type of evaluation, approaches to and components of an evaluation plan, some of the problems involved in the evaluation process, and use of results.

Rationale for Administrative Evaluation

Should administrators of colleges and universities undergo formal evaluation? A survey of the current literature in higher education indicates that increased pressure from above and below and the demand for accountability from government and institutional constituencies will make this type of evaluation essential or at least highly desirable in the cloudy future of higher education.

The concept of administrative evaluation is affirmed by the AAUA in its professional standards for administrators. In considering the rights of administrators, the AAUA endorses the concept that administrators are entitled to be participants in regular and formal performance evaluations of their positions and also are entitled to receive the results of these evaluations (AAUA 1975). The AAUP also upholds the concept in its statements of 1974 where suggestion is made that faculty be involved in selection and retention of administrators and that some system be devised to determine the level of confidence enjoyed by the chief administrative officer (AAUP 1974). As the general public continues to raise questions regarding accountability and productivity, and students' demands for better service make efficient administrative skills an ever-increasing necessity, it is difficult to ignore or deny the importance of administrative evaluation (Anderson 1975; Clifford 1976; Grote 1978; MacVittie 1975; Skipper 1977; Surwill and Heywood 1976; Sprunger, Berquist, and Quehl 1978; Williams 1977). In a survey of all public and private higher educational institutions in Ohio, Van de Visse (1974) found that the majority of presidents in these institutions agreed that a formal administrative evaluation would be a useful response to accountability but few actually had such a system in operation. Anderson (1975) agrees with this purpose and suggests administrative evaluation as a vehicle for study of an institution's productivity, efficiency, social utility, worthiness, and accountability. According to Grote (1978), adapting an industrial model such as PAS (Performance Appraisal System) to postsecondary education can satisfy the general public regarding their concern for accountability and productivity. Koplitz (1976) suggests that administrative evaluation may be mandatory in the near future. Clifford (1976) maintains there should be no question about whether to evaluate or why but that the real issue should be how we evaluate and by what critieria.

Miller (1974) proposes the following rationale for administrative evaluation: to assist in developing awareness of competencies; to identify general areas in behavior, adequacies, and skills in which improvements are needed; and to develop realistic employment objectives, short- and long-range, in order to assist professional growth of individual administrators. Genova et al. (1976) suggest that evaluation can be used for sharing governance and increasing team administration. Miller (1976) also sees administrative evaluation as beneficial in helping to develop some sort of administrative scheme for behavior, goals, and outcomes.

Emphasis is placed on the importance of administrative evaluation as an essential component of total institutional evaluation rather than an isolated entity. Miller (1972, 1974) endorses this concept, particularly if the goals are growth, improvement of personnel, and increased efficiency. Fisher (1977) emphasizes the importance of the total package for evaluation and development of an institution. The

ABOUT THE AUTHOR . . . Carolyn Winschel, C.D.P., is Director of Special Projects at La Roche College.

NOTES

Administrative evaluation is still in its infancy.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The majority of presidents agreed that a formal administrative evaluation would be a useful response to accountability but few actually had such a system in operation.

Emphasis is placed on the importance of administrative evaluation as an essential component of total institutional evaluation.

HE 011 380

notion of providing benefit for all constituencies is also considered important by Thomas et al. (1977). Additional pressure for administrative evaluation is being exerted by faculty members and students who are asking that evaluation not be restricted to them but be extended to include administrators (Farmer 1976; Miller; Thomas et al.; Sprunger et al., 1978).

Making personnel decisions is suggested as a rationale for evaluation but less frequently than that of development. With the pressure of accountability and the lack of mobilitity in the job market, this rationale could become more important in the future (Anderson 1975; Surwill and Heywood 1976; Thomas et al.; Bornholdt 1978). Systems such as those at Dartmouth, SUNY, and in the Minnesota State system make reappointment contingent on formal evaluation (Bornholdt 1978; Block 1976).

Administrative evaluation can assist in coping with some of the problems of higher education such as inflation, reduced income, and faculty and staff militancy.

Skipper (1977), in analyzing the skills of effective and ineffective leaders, suggests that administrative evaluation can assist in coping with some of the problems of higher education such as inflation, reduced income, and faculty and staff militancy.

With reference to presidential evaluation, Williams (1977) suggests a different rationale. She proposes that evaluation provides a review of the office of president with delineation of the role, responsibilities, and expectations of the office. In a period when roles and missions of institutions of higher education are changing, this can be a type of in-service education for the president. Evaluation provides periodic reviews to re-examine the president and the institution to see if they are heading in the same direction (Block 1976; Parekh 1977). Sprunger et al. (1978) extend this rationale to include all administrative positions.

The greatest value of administrative evaluation is its value as a model and the incentive it offers to other segments of the institution.

In addition to many of the functions already listed, Sprunger et al. suggest that perhaps the greatest value of administrative evaluation is its value as a model and the incentive it offers to other segments of the institution.

Although many possible reasons for evaluation are suggested, the main rationale seems to emerge as twofold: administrative growth and development and accountability to the institution as well as to its various publics.

Evaluation Plans or Approaches

The plans or approaches for evaluation of adminstrators are as varied as the institutions that conduct them.

The plans or approaches for evaluation of administrators are as varied as the institutions that conduct them and differ substantially even as to which administrators are being evaluated and who conducts the evaluation. Much of the literature on the administrative level centers around the chief executive officer (e.g., AAUP 1974; Hillway 1973; MacVittie 1975; Munitz 1976; Williams 1977), although specific characteristics and procedures are also provided for evaluation of other administrators (Anderson 1975; Laffin 1975; Miller 1974; Zion 1977). The following section outlines some proposed plans or approaches.

Five general approaches to evaluation in higher education are: "professional judgment," "measurement," "congruence between performance and objectives," "decision oriented," and "goal free/responsive." The purposes and circumstances of the evaluation determine which method is to be used. For each method or model, Gardner (1977) provides the principal focus, examples, assumptions, advantages, and disadvantages. The "measurement" model, which interprets or references attributes compared to norms by use of a questionnaire type of instrument, and the "congruence between permance and objectives" model, which compares performance with standards of performance, goals, or objectives seem most appropriate for possible administrative evaluation models.

It is recommended that evaluation of an administrator be based on expectations or priorities as determined jointly by the board and administrators at the time of appointment. This is particularly true for presidential evaluation. One suggested process begins with a self-evaluation statement by the administrator that is examined by an ad hoc committee consisting of board members, administrators, faculty, students, and alumni. The statement is then assessed by the committee, which then prepares a portfolio for review by the board. After the board makes its own evaluation of the president, the results are reviewed with the president in order to examine the successes and failures and to determine the reasons for these (Anderson 1975; Gemmell 1976; MacVittie 1975). A similar process would be used with other administrators, the president being chief evaluator. Anderson (1975) cautions that consideration of special strengths and weaknesses or special vision of an administrator may override the entire evaluation and outweigh other factors either because of their very positive or very negative effects.

Consideration of special strengths and weaknesses or special vision of an administrator may override the entire evaluation and outweigh other factors either because of their very positive or very negative effects.

Pollack (1976) and Hanley (1975) recommend use of a self-evaluation component as well as evaluation by a formal committee. In a study of North Carolina technical institutes to determine criteria for evaluation, Pollack found major agreement around composition of a formal evaluation committee to include supervisor, faculty, peers, students, and, most important of all, administrative staff. Alumni or outside consultants were not recommended to be included on the committee. Hanley suggests that the committee consist of board members and possibly a consultant and a fellow president wherever possible. Hanley infers that this method can be a reciprocal evaluation of the board's effectiveness in determining presidential role and institutional priorities.

Munitz (1976) presents a smiliar model in which the president determines objectives according to the priorities set by the board and in a written essay analyzes his progress toward these objectives. The main difference in his method is that a consultant judges the evaluation essay and reports his findings to the board and the president. Hays (1976) describes a plan used in Minnesota that includes suggested criteria and detailed procedures for the evaluation team, presidential self-assessment, and the report.

One unique approach suggested asking an administrator how he expects others to evaluate him and then comparing the actual results with his perceptions. Along with other information obtained, this enables him to determine the accuracy of his perception in obtaining feedback from others (Sprunger et al. 1978).

Evaluation usually presupposes some sort of comparison, either with predecessors, peers, some ideal, past performance, or others' expectations.

Other viewpoints stress the essence of the evaluation process as assessment of competency-based performance, grounded on the goal expectations as determined by the administrators, superiors, and subordinates. Fisher (1977) suggests that evaluation usually presupposes some sort of comparison, either with predecessors, peers, some ideal, past performance, or others' expectations.

Seven guidelines or principles are proposed for determining an approach to or procedures for evaluation: (1) the system is rooted in the history, traditions, mission, and objectives of each institution; (2) the approach is positive focusing on administrative development as its primary purpose; (3) expectations are on the basis of performance evaluation based on current job descriptions; (4) evaluation consists of both objective and subjective measures; (5) immediate superiors have primary responsibility for evaluation and only those in a position to validly judge are involved; (6) those being evaluated are fully informed of procedures, timetable, and results; (7) confidentiality is observed throughout the process (Miller 1974).

Miller further outlines a procedure for each major administrative position. His method of presidential evaluation is similar to Pollack's (1976), Anderson's (1975) and Munitz's (1976) in that it consists of a president's report on major accomplishments in keeping with his role and the institutional goals, and in the composition of a formal committee for evaluation consisting of trustees, faculty, and students. Responsibility for developing the overall plan and procedure rests with the board, assisted by the president.

Responsiblity for developing the overall plan and procedures rests with the board, assisted by the president.

Another method surveyed provides a performance evaluation of educational leaders (PEEL) in which there is evaluation of seven areas of behaviorally-stated definitions of administrative competency. Although originally designed for secondary school administrators, it has possibilities for adaptation to postsecondary education (Metzger 1976).

The importance of having administrative involvement in the design, administration, and review of the instrument or rating scale cannot be overestimated. It is also important that raters only evaluate characteristics they are actually able to observe (Surwill and Heywood 1976). Provision for this should be built into the rating scale. Williams (1977), like Miller (1976) and Nordvall (1977), stressed the necessity of having the evaluation instrument reflect the operational pattern of the institution, that is, that it be grounded in the history, philosophy, and characteristics of the institution.

Because of the dearth of available systematic programs, Genova (1976) feels that an experimental approach is needed for administrative evaluation. This would concurrently be a planning process and so could have multiple benefits. Growth contracts or plans are the basis of approach for any administrative evaluation, according to Gross (1977). This is in keeping with the approach of using evaluation for administrative development purposes.

Because of the dearth of available systematic programs, an experimental approach is needed for administrative evaluation.

An approach that is becoming more popular is the MBO (management by objectives) approach or administration by objectives, as Miller (1976) calls it. Thomas et al. (1977) propose adaptation of the logic of MBO to higher education. The main purpose is established as performance improvement. In this approach, four areas are analyzed for effectiveness of action: goal formation, goal attainment, resource acquisition, and membership satisfaction (Genova 1976). A formal committee is proposed whose first task is to determine the purposes of evaluation. An attempt is made to identify and understand the current goals of the president to determine how successful and by what means he has attained these goals. Institutional information is collected to identify the aspects of the institution that need improvement. Evaluation of goal appropriateness addresses the questions of whether the goals formed by the president deal with the most pressing needs of the institution and whether appropriate authority patterns were used to attain these goals. The final step is formation of new goals. The entire process uses information gathered from students, faculty, and administration.

Evaluation of goal appropriateness addresses the questions of whether the goals formed by the president deal with the most pressing needs of the institution and whether appropriate authority patterns were used to attain these goals.

Sprunger et al. (1978) summarize six approaches to administrative evaluation: unstructured narration, unstructured documentation, structured narration, rating scales, structured documentation (portfolios), and management by objectives (MBO). Most of the approaches described fall into one of these six categories. In their description of each approach, the authors describe the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the twelve functions suggested by them for evaluation. Sample instruments are also provided.

An approach has been suggested by Thomas et al. (1977) for setting up roles to facilitate the assessment process for administrators other than the president. The first step consists of the individual and his supervisor each listing what they consider the areas of responsibility and functions for that individual. They then compare and discuss their respective lists and work for agreement on the responsibilities. The revised list is shared among all administrators and the final list developed by consensus. Goals are then set up within each area. This serves as the basis for assessment.

A suggested plan for evaluation of the academic dean or academic vice president as outlined by Miller (1974) is similar to that suggested for presidents. As with the president, the academic dean submits a written statement outlining his major accomplishments and how successfully he perceives himself as having fulfilled his own job description in light of the institutional goals. Evaluation involves the president, representatives of the faculty, and other administrators. During the process, the dean is given full opportunity to present his views. The final report is given to both the president and the dean. Genova et al. (1976) and Hoyle (1973) suggest procedures for academic deans and other administrators.

As with the president, the academic dean submits a written statement outlining his major accomplishments and how successfully he perceives himself as having fulfilled his own job description in light of the institutional goals.

Laffin (1975) is the only author surveyed who concentrated on an approach for administrative staff. He suggests that evaluation be carried out by the supervisor and that the criteria include effectiveness in performance, mastery of specialization, professional ability, effectiveness in institutional service, and continuing growth. He lists specific details as to what is included in each of these categories.

Criteria for Evaluation

Anderson (1975) proposes the following areas for generation of criteria for evaluation: education and experience, productivity and efficiency, performance criteria, leadership, management, personal performance, personal qualities, educational statesmanship, political and fiscal astuteness, and administrative style. Skipper (1977) used a set of leadership skills for examining personal characteristics of effective and ineffective leaders. From these studies he proposes a set of seven broad areas of administrative skills and six personal characteristics that can be used as a basis for evaluation. Sprunger et al. (1978) propose seven areas used as foci for rating scales. Koplitz (1978) has identified and studied

43 qualities or characteristics and 29 activities or behavioral traits of administrators. Through analysis these have been combined and condensed to form a Rating Scale for Academic Administrators (RSAA), which contains 15 characteristics and 9 behavioral traits. Composite lists of a variety of characteristics are also proposed by Anderson (1975, 1977); Dickson et al. (1976); Fenker (1975); Grote (1978); Hillway (1973); Laffin (1975); Pollack (1976); Surwill and Heywood (1976); Thomas et al. (1977); and Williams (1977). In some cases, criteria are specific to presidential evaluation and in others apply generally to all administrators. In either case the characteristics, skills, or criteria seem to fall into one of two categories, administrative skills and personal characteristics or "people" skills. Under administrative skills are included such abilities as leadership, planning, decision making, delegation of responsibility, problem solving, operating methods, goal completion, educational program supervision, and fiscal control. Personal skills include flexibility, creativity, responsibility, integrity, communication, individual and community relations, tolerance, persistence, and ability to foster morale and creativity. Other considerations are investigation of continued professional growth and examination of limitations or strengths critical to a particular college's welfare.

The characteristics, skills, or criteria seem to fall into one of two categories, administrative skills and personal characteristics or "people" skills.

Specific criteria for evaluation of the academic dean or vice president are proposed by J. Gould and M. Wicke as outlined in Anderson (1975). These include the manner in which he enjoys the respect and confidence of faculty; how he encourages and prods the faculty toward excellence; how he delegates responsibilities and helps prepare people to carry out their responsibilities. Other qualities include integrity, consistency, patience, openness, and loyalty to the standards of the academic profession. In addition, Wicke considers how he defines the institutional mission and translates it into action, and how he achieves ordering of internal conflict.

Responsibility for and Involvement in the Evaluation Process

The question of who should be responsible or involved in evaluation of administrators has been addressed to some extent in the various approaches suggested in an earlier section. However, the topic needs to be considered further, particularly in discussion of whether evaluation should be upward, downward, parallel, or a combination of these approaches.

The idea of faculty involvement in administrative evaluation seems to be growing in acceptance as is evidenced in its recommendation by most of the authors surveyed (Anderson 1975; AAUP 1974; Cousins and Rogus 1977; Dickson et al. 1976; Fenker 1975; Genova 1976; Hillway 1973; Pollack 1976; Sprunger et al. 1978; Surwill and Heywood 1976; Thomas et al. 1977). This is particularly true in the case of evaluation of academic deans or academic vice presidents. In its professional standards of 1975, the AAUA states that the evaluation process for all levels of administration should include the participation of the administrator being evaluated (AAUA 1975).

The idea of faculty involvement in administrative evaluation seems to be growing in acceptance.

As has been previously suggested, a formal evaluation committee with varying composition has been recommended by a number of authors. In most cases this committee consists of a component of upward, downward, and parallel evaluation (Anderson 1975; Hanley 1975; Miller 1974; Pollack 1976; Surwill and Heywood 1976; Thomas et al. 1977; Williams 1977). Fisher (1977) suggests that the degree of upward, downward, or parallel input depends on what position is being evaluated and the individual circumstances of the institution. In each case, factors such as desirability, time, effort, cost, and practicality must be taken into consideration.

One model presented suggests a primary and a secondary evaluator for each administrator or group of administrators. Primarily, the board chairperson evalutes the president, the president evaluates the vice president, and so on down to the directors. Secondarily, the board evaluates the president, the board chairperson evaluates the deans, and the vice president evaluates the directors (Grote 1978). Without exception in all the approaches reviewed, ultimate responsibility for presidental evaluation rests with the board, the board chairperson, or a board committee. Responsibility for evaluation of other administrators rests with the president and/or board.

Ultimate responsibility for presidential evaluation rests with the board, the board chairperson, or a board committee.

Problems with Administrative Evaluation

Historically speaking, administrative evaluation in higher education is almost too new a development to have been assessed to any great extent. Yet higher educational professionals already write of existing or potential problems in the process.

Potential problems include a series of objections to evaluation as presented by Cousins and Rogus (1977). These include the question of the validity of faculty judgment, bad publicity about the process, mistaking of popularity of admnistrators with real worth, recruitment problems, and the use to which evaluation results are put. The authors' findings indicate that what have been registered as objections have not yet proven to be actual problems in practice. They suggest, however, that the use of results could be troublesome.

Other objections referring particularly to evaluation of academic deans include: impossibility of defining such a complex job, the fact that academic administrators must accept priorities set by others and hence have no context for evaluation, the suggestion that no one can understand the total picture of a dean's job, and the supposition that deans inevitably make enemies (Bornholdt 1978). Although Bornholdt addresses only academic deans, these objections might also be made by or referring to almost any administrator.

Losak (1975) suggests that the greatest problem in evaluation is the difficulty of rational and objective judgement. He focuses on three variables that reduce objectivity, namely, psychological factors such as power relationships and rumor, the atmosphere of the college such as the favoring of those who participate in the process, and factors external to the college such as laws involving ethnic, sex, or racial balance.

The greatest problem in evaluation is the difficulty of rational and objective judgement.

As is suggested by Fenker (1975) and other writers in this area, the dearth of information available on this subject as well as the scarcity of available published instruments are problems. Johnston (1977) indicates that the use of standardized instruments is not appropriate because of the uniqueness of each

In addition to the lack of information or published instruments, an overall problem is that higher education does not really lend itself very readily to systematic assessment.

individual institution's situation. Another problem mentioned by Johnston is the tension engendered in the evaluation process. He feels, however, that the value of increased efficiency that could result makes it worth the effort.

The lack of information available on the subject is verified by Surwill and Heywood (1976). In their survey of AASCU members in 1976, they found that only 32 percent of responding institutions had a formal evaluation procedure. They also found a dearth of information available as reported both in ERIC and in DATRIX, a source of information on dissertations. Van de Visse (1974), in a similar survey of higher educational institutions in Ohio, found only 28 percent of the respondents reported having a formal, ongoing evaluation program. In addition to the lack of information or published instruments, an overall problem is that higher education does not really lend itself very readily to systematic assessment (Fisher 1977).

The use of results should be known and agreed to by all concerned prior to the actual evaluation process.

The question of confidentiality and who should receive results is problematic.

Use of Results

Use of information from an administrative evaluation is determined to a great extent by the rationale or purpose for which the evaluation is conducted and also by the composition of the group of evaluators. The use of results should be known and agreed to by all concerned prior to the actual evaluation process (Fisher 1977). The question of confidentiality and who should receive results is problematic. Viewpoints on this range from limiting access to the results to the administrator being evaluated to distributing the results to all constituencies involved in the evaluation process (Surwill and Heywood 1976).

It is recommended that anyone who participates in evaluation procedures has the right to some feedback, depending on the degree of involvement. It is understood that the primary supervisor will receive the results. The administrator being evaluated should have access to all information unless some other agreement was made prior to the process. If groups have been involved in the process, each group should receive feedback regarding their group's evaluation but not that of any other group, e.g., faculty evaluating an academic dean would receive results from the faculty's evaluation of the dean but not from the president's or others' evaluation of the dean (Thomas et al. 1977). Genova et al. (1976) predicts that an evaluation will be a failure if there is no feedback and advocates full disclosure of summarized results.

Even when disclosure is endorsed, the manner of disclosure is the key to success (Genova et al. 1976). Reasons given for disclosure include the concept of accountability to all constituencies, increasing the visibility of administrators to constituencies, possible improvement of morale by improving the climate of mutual trust and respect, and a more equitable distribution of the pressure of "consumer" concerns normally reserved to faculty by evaluation (Thomas et al. 1977). Obviously, none of these results is guaranteed just because an institution discloses the results of evaluation.

Results should be used jointly by the supervisor and administrator being evaluated to reinforce positive behavior and explore means of growth in improving specific areas of weakness.

If the primary purpose of evaluation is improvement of the individual as recommended by Fisher (1977), then results should be used jointly by the supervisor and administrator being evaluated to reinforce positive behavior and explore means of growth in improving specific areas of weakness. This type of use of results would be similar to that suggested by the use of growth contracts (Gross 1977).

If the rationale for evaluation is to make personnel decisions, then obviously results will be used in making decisions around continuance in or removal from office, or for advice and counsel for future service, salary increases, promotions, and tenure (Anderson 1975).

Summary and Conclusions

Informal administrative evaluation has always been a component in higher education. Even though formal administrative evaluation is still in an early stage of development, it shows promise for responding to demands for accountability and also to the need for continued administrative growth and development. Few published plans are available, which militates against the success of the process, but the literature and research indicate improvement in this area (Sprunger et al. 1978). The use of results still needs clarification. Farmer (1976) has suggested that basic issues such as the purpose of evaluation, designation of responsibility for evaluation, characteristics to be evaluated, gathering data procedures, and use of results must be addressed before administrative evaluation can be successfully achieved.

It remains for each institution to seriously examine the desirability and importance of such a process, to weigh the benefits in relation to the expenditure of cost, time, and effort, and to determine in which direction it will proceed.

With all of the factors presented here for consideration, it remains for each institution to seriously examine the desirability and importance of such a process, to weigh the benefits in relation to the expenditure of cost, time, and effort, and to determine in which direction it will proceed.

Bibliography

To order documents in the bibliography identified by an ED number, write to ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. Documents with HE numbers are presently being processed by EDRS and will be assigned ED numbers upon publication in Research in Education (RIE). In ordering, ED numbers must be specified. MF indicates microfiche and HC denotes hard copy; payment must accompany orders of less than $10.00; and all orders must be in writing.

Anderson, C. L. "Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes and Outcomes." University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Center for Study of Higher Education, 1975. ED 129 198. 76 pgs. MF HC.

"Evaluation of Academic Administrators." Paper presented at CASC/AAHE Conference, February 4, 1977, at Warrenton, Virginia. ED 136 629. 26 pg. MR HC.

AAUA. "Professional Standards for Administrators in Higher Education." Communique 4 (Fall 1975).

AAUP. "Faculty Participation in Selection and Retention of Administrators." AAUP Statements, 60 (November 1974): 414-15.

Block, M. H. "Strategies for Implementing an Evaluation System." Address presented at AAUA Regional Seminar, November 18, 1976, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Mimeographed.
Bornholdt, L. "Evaluating the Evaluators." *Proceedings of the American Conference of Academic Deans — Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting*. Grand Forks, North Dakota: University of North Dakota, February 1978.
Clifford, E. W. "Evaluation: By the Number . . . And More." Paper presented at AAUA Regional Seminar, November 18, 1976, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Mimeographed.
Cousins, A. N. and Rogus, J. F. "Evaluating Academic Administrators — From Below." *Liberal Education* 63 (March 1977): 91-101.
Dickson, S. et al. *Review of a College President*. Buffalo: SUNY College at Buffalo, 1976. ED 131 786. 15 pgs. MF HC.
Farmer, C. H. "Evaluation of Administrators in Higher Education." Paper presented at AAUA Regional Seminar, November 18, 1976, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Mimeographed.
Fenker, R. F. "The Evaluation of University Faculty and Administrators — A Case Study." *Journal of Higher Education* 46 (November 1975): 665-86.
Fisher, C. F. "The Evaluation and Development of College and University Administrators." *AAHE Bulletin* 30 (March 1977): 3-6.
Gardner, D. E. "Five Evaluation Frameworks — Implications for Decision Making in Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education* 48 (September-October 1977): 571-93.
Gemmell, J. "Evaluation of Presidents: Boon or Boondoggle." Paper presented at AAUA Regional Seminar, November 18, 1976, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Mimeographed.
Genova, W. et al. *Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education*. Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1976.
Gross, R. F. "Facilitating Administrator Development Through Growth Contracts." Paper presented at CASC/AAHE Conference, February 4, 1977, at Warrenton, Virginia. ED 134 074. 8 pgs. MF HC.
Grote, C. N. "Compensating Administrative Personnel — Adapting an Industrial Model to Postsecondary Education." *Journal of College and University Personnel Association* 29 (Summer 1978): 31-42.
Hanley, D. L. "Evaluating a President." *AGB Reports* 17 (March-April 1975): 42-7.
Hays, G. D. "Evaluating a President: Criteria and Procedures." *AGB Reports* 18 (November-December 1976): 41-6.
Hillway, T. "Evaluating College and University Administrators." *Intellect* 101 (1973): 426-7.
Hoyle, J. R. "To Evaluate a Dean." *Intellect* 102 (November 1973): 96-7.
Johnston, A. B. "Evaluation of Administrators." Paper presented at AAUA Seminar, April 4, 1977, at Mobile, Alabama. ED 136 858. 7 pgs. MF HC.
Koplitz, E. D. "Academic Administration: An Approach to Effective Evaluation in Higher Education." Paper presented at Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education Fourth Annual National Conference, October 20, 1978, at Afton, Oklahoma. Mimeographed.
Laffin, C. "Evaluating Performance of Non-Teaching Professionals." Paper presented at annual meeting of American Society for Engineering Education, June 1875, at Colorado. ED 118 407. 17 pgs. MF HC.
Losak, J. "Myth of Rational Evaluation." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, April 14, 1975, at Seattle, Washington. ED 112 999. 12 pgs. MF HC.
MacVittie, R. W. "Trustees and Evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer." Paper presented at regents' Trustees Conference, March 13, 1975, at New York. ED 108 538. 14 pgs. MF HC.
Metzger, C. "A Competency-Based Program — Performance Evaluation of the Educational Leader." *NASSP Bulletin* 60 (March 1976): 95-105.
Miller, R. I. *Evaluating Faculty Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
"The Implications of Evaluation." Address presented at AAUA Regional Seminar, November 18, 1976, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Mimeographed.
Munitz, B. "Measuring a President's Performance." *AGB Reports* 18 (January-February 1976): 36-40.
Nordvall, R. C. "Evaluation of College Administrators: Where Are We Now?" *NASPA Journal* 16 (Fall 1977): 53-9.
Parekh, S. "Presidential Evaluation Equals Long-Range Planning." *Planning for Higher Education* 6 (December 1977): 3.
Pollack, J. D. *The Development and Testing of a Criterion Referenced Evaluation System for Faculty and Administrators in Technical Institutes/Community Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, HEW, 1976. ED 133 578. 169 pgs. MF HC.
Skipper, C. E. "Personal Characteristics of Effective and Ineffective University Leaders." *College and University* 51 (Winter 1976): 138-41.
"Administrative Skills of Effective and Ineffective University Leaders." *College and University* 52 (Spring 1977): 276-99.
"Factor Analysis of University Leaders' Behavior." *College and University* 53 (Spring 1978): 330-4.
Sprunger, B., Berquist, W., and Quehl, G. *Handbook for College Administrators*. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1978.
Surwill, B. J. and Heywood, S. J. *Evaluating of College and University Top Brass: That State of the Art*. Washington, D.C.: AASCU, 1976. ED 129 142. 38 pgs. MF HC.
Thomas, G., Genova, W., Madoff, M., and Chin, R. "Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Administrators." *Journal of College and University Personnel Association*, 29 (Summer 1977): 13-24.
Van de Visse, M. "The Evaluation of Administrative Performance in Higher Education." *Dissertation Abstracts* 35 (1974): 11A: 7092.
Williams, R. E. *Presidential Evaluation*. SUNY at Buffalo: Department of Higher Education, 1977. ED 144 643. 32 pgs. MF HC.
Zion, C. "Role Definition: A Focus for Administrative Growth and Evaluation." *Journal of College and University Personnel Association* 28 (Summer 1977): 5-12.

Administrators Update is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association of University Administrators for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinion, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either AAUA or the National Institute of Education.

Copies of Administrators Update may be ordered for 50¢ each from the American Association of University Administrators, P. O. Box 6, Bidwell Station, Buffalo, New York 14222. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

American Association of University Administrators

ADMINISTRATORS UPDATE

P.O. Box 6
Bidwell Station
Buffalo, N.Y. 14222

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Buffalo, N.Y.
Permit No. 4970